



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,315	03/24/2004	David M. Durham	42P19299	6493
45209	7590	07/06/2009		
INTEL/BSTZ BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			EXAMINER SCHMIDT, KARI L	
			ART UNIT 2439	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/06/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/809,315

Applicant(s)

DURHAM ET AL.

Examiner

KARI L. SCHMIDT

Art Unit

2439

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-33 and 35-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-33 and 35-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/9/2009, 5/6/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

This communication is in response filed on 03/09/2009. Claims 1-5, 7-33 and 35-38 are pending. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 11, 22, 24, 29-31 and 35-36 have been amended. Claims 6 and 34 have been canceled. The examiner further notes the objection to claims 1 and 5 for informalities have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 11, 13-16, 18-20, 22, 24-17, 29 and 30-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The examiner notes the arguments directed to Davis and Ravi failing to teach "...prior to any allowing of the requested secure connection, the embedded agent of the one of the clients verifying that a platform of the one of the clients is not in a compromised state at a time before providing access to the encrypted traffic flow, and in response to the message requesting the secure connection and the verifying, the embedded agent of the one of the clients providing the key and an assertion that the one of the clients is not compromised to a verification entity on the network," are not persuasive.

The examiner disagrees and notes that the combination of Davis in view of Ravi Remer and Cromer discloses the claimed limitation. The examiner notes Davis discloses prior to allowing of a secure connection, the embedded agent of the one of the clients verifying that a platform of the one of the clients is not in a compromised state at

a time before providing access to the encrypted traffic flow and further notes this would further include in response to verifying (see at least, [0038]: the examiner notes if (e.g.) a smart card is utilized it must be authenticated and verified (e.g. client platform is not compromised) before allowing communication and [0042]: the examiner notes the security processing system also serves as a trusted hardware device that can authenticate and communicate verification of the status of the input device (e.g. host platform) to the host processor). The examiner notes that the idea of Davis authenticating and communicating verification of the status of the input device reads on the limitation of not in a compromised state at a given time due to the facet that the device authenticated and its status is verified before any encrypted traffic flow is begun. From here the examiner sought to combine Remer to disclose allowing for the verification of a client that can receive a message requesting a secure connection for the encrypted traffic flow (see at least, col. 10, lines 4-31: the examiner notes wishing to establish a secure connection via the use of a message) and Cromer discloses an agent providing the key and an assertion that the client is not compromised to a verification entity on the network (see at least, Cromer, [0048] and [0056]: the examiner notes ensuring the security of the computer system (e.g. verification entity) is not compromised by an unauthorized action by the remote client (e.g. client) and the use of public/private key algorithm to verify the remote client). Further Cromer discloses indicating being compromised and foreclosing network access if being compromised (see at least, [0048] and [0056]: the examiner notes querying the integrity is a form of requesting (e.g. indicating) of being compromised and culminating without further processing is

interpreted to be foreclosing). The examiner notes the elements from Remer and Cromer can be combined to Davis in view of Ravi in order to achieve a predictable result therefore this argument is not persuasive.

With respect to the argument directed to Cromer, more specifically, "whether or how any alleged providing of a key and an assertion might be conditioned upon actually verifying whether a platform of the remote client is in a compromised state at a particular time." The examiner notes Davis discloses prior to allowing of a secure connection, the embedded agent of the one of the clients verifying that a platform of the one of the clients is not in a compromised state at a time before providing access to the encrypted traffic flow (see at least, [0038]: the examiner notes if (e.g.) a smart card is utilized it must be authenticated and verified (e.g. client platform is not compromised) before allowing communication and [0042]: the examiner notes the security processing system also serves as a trusted hardware device that can authenticate and communicate verification of the status of the input device (e.g. host platform) to the host processor). Therefore this argument is not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 11, 13-16, 18-20, 22, 24-27, 29, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. (US 2005/0076228 A1) in view of Ravi et al. (US 2005/0204155 A1) and Remer et al. (US 7,076,653 B1) and Cromer et al. (US 2005/0166213 A1).

Claims 1, 11, 22, and 29

Davis discloses provisioning a symmetric key across multiple clients through multiple embedded agents (see at least, abstract, [0025]: the examiner notes that a client can consist of a PDA, cellular phone, network-enabled device that is connected to a network and [0029]: the examiner notes a security processor is separate from the host processor and is noted to be the embedded agent and [0074]: the examiner notes the security processor's control processor (e.g. part of the embedded agent) contains symmetric-key encryption), each client having one of the embedded agents, each embedded agent to store the symmetric cryptographic key in a storage accessible to the embedded agent ([0029]: the examiner notes a security processor is separate from the host processor and acts as the embedded agent and [0074]: the examiner notes the security processor's control processor (e.g. part of the embedded agent) contains symmetric key

encryption/decryption) and providing access to encrypted traffic flow in a network to one of the clients if the one of the clients is authenticated with the key (see at least, [0026]: the examiner notes the secure I/O system performs all network processing and [0048]: the examiner notes the security processor can perform IKE (e.g. internet key exchange is noted as a form of mutual authentication using pre-shared keys (e.g. symmetric, shared, or secret key) between multiple parties). Further Davis discloses that a secure memory not visible to applications and an OS running on the host platform and transparent network link (see at least, [0025]: the examiner notes security processing is segregated from other processing (e.g. protected) and [0026]: the examiner notes the security processing performs all network processing). Further Davis discloses a digital signal processor coupled with the host platform for use in a VPN (see at least, [0025]: the examiner notes a secure I/O allows for a VPN connection and [0030]: the examiner notes an interface may consist of a PHY layer processing (e.g. DSP)). **Davis further discloses prior to allowing of a secure connection, the embedded agent of the one of the clients verifying that a platform of the one of the clients is not in a compromised state at a time before providing access to the encrypted traffic flow and further notes this would further include in response to verifying (see at least, [0038]: the examiner notes if (e.g.) a smart card is utilized it must be authenticated and verified (e.g. client platform is not compromised) before allowing communication and [0042]: the examiner notes the security processing system also serves as a trusted hardware device that can authenticate and**

communicate verification of the status of the input device (e.g. host platform) to the host processor).

Davis fails to disclose that the storage accessible to the embedded agent is not directly accessible to a host processor on the client and further the providing including: the one of the clients receiving a message requesting a secure connection for the encrypted traffic flow and in response to the message requesting the secure connection and the verifying, the embedded agent of the one of the clients providing the key and an assertion that the one of the clients is not compromised to a verification entity on the network.

However Ravi discloses that the storage accessible to the embedded agent is not directly accessible to a host processor on the client (see at least, abstract: the examiner notes a security processor (e.g. embedded agent) containing a first memory (e.g. storage) that is not accessible to the host processor).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Davis's security processor to include a storage that is not directly accessible to a host processor on the client as taught by Ravi. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to ensure that the security processor can handle transactions involving accessing protected memory areas (see at least, Ravi, [0050]).

Davis in view of Ravi fails to disclose the providing including: the one of the clients receiving a message requesting a secure connection for the encrypted traffic

flow and in response to the message requesting the secure connection and the verifying, the embedded agent of the one of the clients providing the key and an assertion that the one of the clients is not compromised to a verification entity on the network.

However Remer discloses a verification of a client that can receive a message requesting a secure connection for the encrypted traffic flow (see at least, col. 9, lines - col. 10, line 31: the examiner notes wishing to establish a secure connection via the use of a message)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Davis and Ravi to include the ability to verify that a client that can receive a message requesting a secure connection for the encrypted traffic flow. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to ensure the ability to support multiple encryption and/or authentication schemes that may be utilized in a connection between two entities (see at least, Remer, col. 2, lines 39-43)).

Davis in view of Ravi and Remer fail to disclose in response to the message requesting the secure connection and the verifying, the embedded agent of the one of the clients providing the key and an assertion that the one of the clients is not compromised to a verification entity on the network.

Cromer discloses an agent providing the key and an assertion that the client is not compromised to a verification entity on the network (see at least, [0048] and [0056]: the examiner notes ensuring the security of the computer

system (e.g. verification entity) is not compromised by an unauthorized action by the remote client (e.g. client) and the use of public/private key algorithm to verify the remote client). Further Cromer discloses indicating being compromised and foreclosing network access if being compromised (see at least, [0048] and [0056]: the examine querying the integrity is a form of requesting (e.g. indicating) of being compromised and culminating without further processing is interpreted to be foreclosing).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings Davis in view of Ravi to include the embedded agent providing the key and an assertion that the client is not compromised to a verification entity on the network as taught by Cromer. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to manage a remote client on a computer system in a secure manner by verifying if the OS is not loaded or functioning (see at least, Cromer, [0008]).

Claim 2 and 30

Davis discloses wherein provisioning the key through the embedded agents further comprises provisioning the key through an embedded agent having network access via a network link not visible to a host operating system (OS) running on the client (see at least, [0025]: the examiner notes security processing is segregated from other processing (e.g. protected) and further this is interpreted to include OS processing and

[0026]: the examiner notes the security processing performs all network processing and would also be segregated from the other processing (e.g. OS processing of the client).

Claim 3 and 31

Davis discloses providing access to the traffic flow if the client is authenticated comprises the embedded agent authenticating the client over the network line not visible to the host OS (see at least, [0025]: the examiner notes security processing is segregated from other processing (e.g. protected) and further this is interpreted to include OS processing and [0026]: the examiner notes the security processing performs all network processing (e.g. [0048]: the examiner notes IKE is a form of authenticating over a network) and would also be segregated from the other processing (e.g. OS processing of the client).

Claim 4 and 32

Davis discloses wherein providing access to the traffic flow further comprises providing multiple clients access with the key to nodes in the network, the nodes in the network to decrypt the traffic flow and subsequently encrypt the traffic flow to transmit the traffic to a next node in the network (see at least, [0070]: the examiner notes symmetric key encryption and decryption processing within the security processing system for use in IKE).

Claim 13

Davis discloses wherein the embedded device to have a transparent network link comprises the embedded device to have a network connection not accessible by the host platform, the link to comply with the secure sockets layer (SSL) protocol (see at least, [0025]: the examiner notes security processing is segregated from other processing (e.g. protected) and further this is interpreted to include OS processing and [0026]: the examiner notes the security processing performs all network processing (e.g. [0048]: the examiner notes IKE is a form of authenticating over a network) and would also be segregated from the other processing (e.g. OS processing of the client and [0076]: the examiner notes the use of SSL protocols).

Claim 14

Davis discloses wherein the embedded device to authenticate the apparatus comprises the embedded device to verify the identity of the apparatus to a network switching device with the key, the key to also be used by the network endpoints to verify their respective identities to the network switching device, and the network switching device to decrypt encrypted traffic from the apparatus and the network endpoints (see at least, [0074]: the examiner note IKE and the use of symmetric key encryption and decryption as a forum of authentication of identities between devices).

Claim 15 and 26

Davis discloses wherein the embedded device to authenticate the apparatus comprises the embedded device to hash traffic to be transmitted with the key (see at least, [0069]: the examiner notes a cryptographic core for high-speed encryption and hash processing for packet data).

Claim 16 and 27

Davis discloses wherein the embedded device to authenticate the apparatus comprises the embedded device to perform cryptographic services with the key on traffic to be transmitted (see at least, [0074]: the examiner notes IKE and the use of symmetric key encryption and decryption for traffic to be transmitted).

Claim 18

Davis discloses further comprising a second embedded computation device, the second computation device integrated on the host platform, to verify the security of the host platform (see at least, [0080]: the examiner notes an anti-tamper system is embedded device that contains circuits to check health and integrity of the content in the system).

Claim 19

Davis discloses wherein the first embedded device to not authenticate the apparatus if the second embedded device determines the host platform is not secure (see at least, [0076]: the examiner notes verifying application integrity and [0080]: the examiner notes

an anti-tamper system within the security processor checks the integrity of the flash content (e.g. application integrity) and in which it can serve as a trusted device to authenticate another hardware security token connected on (e.g. [0042]))

Claim 20 and 25

Davis discloses further comprising a bi-direction private bus between the first and second embedded device (see at least, [0080]: the examiner notes a the security processor is the first embedded device and contains the anti-tamper system which is the second embedded device and its communication would be private from the host processor (e.g. [0025]: the examiner notes segregated (e.g. private)) and further I/O is a bi-directional bus (eg. [0031])

Claim 24

Davis discloses wherein the embedded chipset comprises an embedded controller agent and an embedded firmware agent, the firmware agent to determine the integrity of the host platform (see at least, [0080]: the examiner notes an anti-tamper system is embedded device that contains circuits to check health and integrity of the content in the system)., and the controller agent to operate the private communication channel and manage access by the host platform to secure network connections (see at least, [0025]: the examiner notes security processing is segregated from other processing (e.g. protected) and further this is interpreted to include OS processing and [0026]: the

examiner notes the security processing performs all network processing and would also be segregated from the other processing (e.g. OS processing of the client).

Claims 5 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. (US 2005/0076228 A1) in view of Ravi et al. (US 2005/0204155 A1) and Remer et al. (US 7,076,653 B1) and Cromer et al. (US 2005/0166213 A1) as applied to claim 1 and 29 above, and further in view of Yokota et al. (US 2002/0164035 A1).

Claims 5 and 33

Davis in view of Ravi and Remer and Cromer all fail to disclose updating at a client the symmetric cryptographic key provisioned across the multiple clients through a public and private key exchange with a public and private key associated the client.

However Yokota discloses updating at a client the symmetric cryptographic key provisioned across the multiple clients through a public and private key exchange with a public and private key associated the client (see at least, abstract)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings Davis in view of Ravi to include updating at a client the symmetric cryptographic key provisioned across the multiple clients through a public and private key exchange with a public and private key associated the client as taught by Yokota. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to enable key

management center to take the initiative by updated keys or a plurality keys at once thereby conforming to a public key cryptosystem (see at least, Yokota, [0014]).

Claims 9 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. (US 2005/0076228 A1) in view of Ravi et al. (US 2005/0204155 A1) and Remer et al. (US 7,076,653 B1) and Cromer et al. (US 2005/0166213 A1) as applied to claim 1 and 29 above, and further in view of Walker et al. (US 2002/0163920 A1).

Claims 9 and 37

Davis in view of Ravi and Remer and Cromer disclose the embedded agent (see claim 1) however all fail to disclose further comprising performing cryptographic functions on data with the key to authenticate data with the key.

However Walker discloses performing cryptographic functions on data with the key to authenticate data with the key (see at least, [0012]: the examiner notes a shared key is used to authenticate packets (e.g. data) that are transported)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings Davis in view of Ravi to include performing cryptographic functions on data with the key to authenticate data with the key as taught by Walker. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to establish confidence that a packet came from the party established by a security association (see at least, Walker, [0012-0013]).

Claims 10, 17, 28, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. (US 2005/0076228 A1) in view of Ravi et al. (US 2005/0204155 A1) and Remer et al. (US 7,076,653 B1) and Cromer et al. (US 2005/0166213 A1) as applied to claims, 1, 11, 22, and 29, and further in view of Ylonen (US 6,782,474 B1)

Davis in view of Ravi and Remer and Cromer disclose the embedded agent (see claim 1) however all fail to disclose further comprising including a derivate of the key in the header of the data to be transmitted to authenticate data with the key.

However Ylonen discloses further comprising including a derivate of the key in the header of the data to be transmitted to authenticate data with the key (see at least, col. 1, lines 56-col. 2, lines 2: the examiner notes a AH is header that contains a computed MAC which is a derivative of the sharked key).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings Davis in view of Ravi and Remer and Cromer to include including a derivate of the key in the header of the data to be transmitted to authenticate data with the key as taught by Ylonen. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to establish implement authentication and security when information travels through the network (see at least, Ylonen, col. 1, lines 34-35 and col. 1, lines 56-co; . 2, lines 2).

Claims 12 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. (US 2005/0076228 A1) in view of Ravi et al. (US 2005/0204155 A1) and Remer et al. (US 7,076,653 B1) and Cromer et al. (US 2005/0166213 A1) as applied to claim 11 and 22 above, and further in view of Grohoski et al. (US 2004/0225885 A1).

Claims 12 and 23

Davis in view of Ravi and Remer and Cromer discloses wherein the embedded device to have a transparent network link comprises the embedded device to have a network connection not accessible by the host platform, the link to comply with the secure protocol (see at least, Davis, [0025], [0026], [0048], and [0076]), however all fail to disclose wherein the secure protocol is a TLS protocol.

However Grohoski discloses wherein the secure protocol is a TLS protocol (see at least, [0167])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Davis in view of Ravi and Remer and Cromer to include the use of TLS protocol because as taught by Grohoski. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide a processor that can support higher speed encryption and decryption as required by SSL/TLS (see at least, Grohoski, [0056]).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. (US 2005/0076228 A1) in view of Ravi et al. (US 2005/0204155 A1) and Remer et al. (US 7,076,653 B1) and Cromer et al. (US 2005/0166213 A1) as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Kramer et al. (US 2005/0201554 A1).

Davis in view of Ravi and Remer and Cromer all fail to disclose further comprising a counter mode hardware cryptographic module on the host platform to encipher traffic with the cryptographic key and further provide a counter mode enciphered of the enciphered traffic.

However Kramer discloses further comprising a counter mode hardware cryptographic module on the host platform to encipher traffic with the cryptographic key and further provide a counter mode enciphered of the enciphered traffic (see at least, [0058] and [0070]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Davis in view of Ravi and Remer and Cromer to include further comprising a counter mode hardware cryptographic module on the host platform to encipher traffic with the cryptographic key and further provide a counter mode enciphered of the enciphered traffic as taught by Kramer. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide encrypting and decrypting data in a network while minimizing interference with future extensions of existing protocols (see at least, Kramer, [0009]).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **KARI L. SCHMIDT** whose telephone number is (571) 270-1385. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on 571-272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christian LaForgia/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2439

/Kari L Schmidt/
Examiner, Art Unit 2439